

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Office Action mailed from the Patent and Trademark Office on January 10, 2008, which has a six-month statutory period set to expire April 10, 2008.

Claims 1-34 were pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1-20 and 29-34 stand rejected under 35 USC 102 and/or 35 USC 103, Claims 26-28 stand rejected under 35 USC 101 and 112, and Claims 21-25 are allowed.

In the current paper, Claims 1, 21 and 26 are amended for clarity, and Claims 29-34 are canceled. In view of these amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections Under 35 USC 112

Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 USC 112 in paragraph 4 of the Office Action because the "language is not clearly understood". Claim 26 is amended to clarify that "each of the plurality of channel numbers having and associated Internet address and an associated Internet site name, wherein a first channel number of the plurality of channel numbers has an associated first internet address that is the same as the Internet address of the Internet site, and an associated first Internet name that is descriptive of the Internet site". No new matter is entered. In view of this amendment reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 112 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 101

Claims 26-28 are also rejected under 35 USC 101 in paragraph 6 of the Office Action. The Examiner suggests "the applicant to amend the claim to make the function related to hardware". Claim 26 is amended to clarify change "means" to "communication circuitry". No new matter is entered. In view

of this amendment reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 101 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claims 1, 3-4, 6-11 and 17 are rejected under 35 USC 102 as being unpatentable over Lin.

In paragraph 32 of the Office Action, the Examiner enters the following comment:

A. As to point (1), the claim language in claim 1 directs to the communication between user and web site only via Internet, the limitation restrict the network only be Internet other than any other network, but the limitation still does not clarify the user will link to the Internet site directly without a intermediate server. Furthermore, although the user's terminal in Lin's system being connected to the Internet through a server, the communication between the user terminal and the selected site is still via the Internet as the Applicant claimed in the claims. Additionally, in the independent claims 1, 21, 26 and 33, the Applicant uses "comprise" to claim the elements of the system, that means the elements of the system should not limited as the Applicant claimed. Thus, Lin is still a relevant prior art reference.

In view of the above remarks , Applicant understands that the Examiner interprets the language in Claim 1 stating communications between the terminal and Internet site "only via the Internet" does not precluding the headend server of Lin. Applicant also understands, by the Examiner's allowance of Claim 25, that the language in Claim 1 stating communications between the terminal and Internet site "directly over the Internet" does achieve the intended purpose of precluding Lin's headend server. Applicant disagrees with the Examiner that the phrases "only via the Internet" and "directly over the Internet" are patentably distinct, but has decided to amend Claim 1 to include "directly

over the Internet" in order to distinguish over Line, thereby placing Claim 1 in condition for allowance.

Claims 3-4, 6-11, and 17 are dependent from Claim 1, and are therefore distinguished over the cited prior art for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections under 35 USC 102.

Rejections Under 35 USC 103

Rejections in view of Lin

In paragraphs 19-26 of the Office Action, Claims 2, 12-16, 18-20, and 29-34 are rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Lin.

Claims 2, 12-16, 18 and 19 are dependent from independent Claim 1, and are therefore believed to be patentable over Lin at least for at least the reasons provided above with reference to Claim 1.

Although Applicants believe Claims 29-34 are distinguished over Lin, Applicants are willing to cancel Claims 29-34 in order to gain allowance of Claims 1-28. Should the Examiner decide not to allow Claims 1-28, Applicants reserve the right to re-enter Claims 29-34 in a subsequent paper.

Rejections over Lin in view of Rosin

In paragraphs 32-34 of the Office Action, Claim 5 is rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Lin in view of Rosin et al. (US 6,397,387 B1; herein Rosin).

Claims 5 is dependent from Claim 1, and is believed to be distinguished of Lin for at least the reasons set forth with respect to Claim 1. Rosin is cited for teaching "an associated parental guidance code", and fails to overcome the deficiencies

of Lin discussed above. Accordingly, it would not have been obvious to combine the teachings of Lin and Rosin to produce the method recited in Applicants' Claim 5.

For the above reasons, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections under 35 USC 103.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-28 are pending in the present Application.
Reconsideration and allowance Claims 1-28 is respectfully
requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Patrick T. Bever/

Customer no. 22888

Patrick T. Bever
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 33,834
408-451-5902